
From: Rupert Sheldrake <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 1:42 PM
To: jeffrey E.
Subject: Re: fields

Dear Jeffrey,

They could be probability fields themselves, you're right. When I first put forward this hypothesis I corresponded with Karl Popper, the philosopher of science, about it and he thought morphic fields sounded like what he called propensity fields, a very similar concept to your probability fields. The problem is that when you propose this idea to people they just can't grasp the idea of free-floating probability fields. They ask "What are they made of?" It's true that it's also hard to answer the question of what are quantum probability fields made of.

But there's a problem with trying to force all natural phenomena into the same shape of distribution that's come before. First of all, as with my own hypothesis, there's the problem of creativity: What about the first one? And secondly some probabilities are passive in the sense that they describe events that must happen, like coin tossing. Others are probability fields associated with self-organising systems, like developing plants. One kind of probability depends on external forces, the other on internal organisational principles. Morphic resonance only applied to the latter.

Best

Rupert

On 11 Jul 2016, at 13:49, jeffrey E. wrote:

why would they influence rather than actually just be a probability field themselves. it also might be fun to think of "luck" as a morphic field. I think a strong argument can be made that the power laws zipfs are the proofs of morphic fields. forcing all natural phenomena into the same shape of distribution that has come before it is very very elegant. and as good a theory as any scientist can propose.

On Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 6:49 AM, Rupert Sheldrake <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Jeffrey,

Yes, I think Brian Josephson is indeed rather scattered.

I don't think Deepak is interested in deep theoretical issues so I don't think you'll succeed in moving him towards the study of probabilities. But I agree with you that it would be better if he stayed away from quantum phenomena which he doesn't know much about and which in relation to medicine and consciousness seem to me to create a cloud of scientific-sounding rhetoric which obscures rather than illuminates the problems.

I'm all for the idea of attractors, but I don't think mathematically so find it hard to grasp probability arguments. Although I think morphic fields are probability structures and work by influencing probabilities.

We leave for a remote island in British Columbia on Wednesday and I'll be away for about 2 months. But still in email contact most of the time.

Rupert

On 9 Jul 2016, at 10:53, jeffrey E. wrote:

he pointed me to brian josephson, seems scattered? view? I'm trying to convince depak to move in the realm and study of probabilities and stay away from quantum phenomena. I think nature's distributions pushing elements to be average, describes many processes. it appears that morphing all local faces into one (average) appears to be beautiful. if things are distributed on a bell curve or normal curve, just looking at the distribution could lead one to think there is a force pushing toward the middle. maybe gravity is just that, probability of all things being equally distributed. appearing as a pseudo force (like centrifugal force). the central limit theorem might answer many mysteries. derivation of the power laws for example. zipf, pareto. if the distributions are the attractors. having even a distribution of esoteric traits like happiness could lead one to believe that if the distribution wants to stay constant. as one point on the curve (the person) if they become happier, the pseudo force would push someone else towards the average. and yes - a few times depak and i roared with laughter.

On Sat, Jul 9, 2016 at 5:30 AM, Rupert Sheldrake <[redacted]>
<mailto:[redacted]> > wrote:

Glad to hear about your meeting. Deepak's good company, has a broad vision, and can be hilarious too.

Rupert

On 8 Jul 2016, at 1:18, jeffrey E. wrote:

depak chopra was here this morning, a great fan of ours

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. Copyright -all rights reserved

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. Copyright -all rights reserved

=